



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ET

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,801	01/26/2004	Reiner Kraft	SVL920030117US1	9772
47069	7590	07/25/2006	EXAMINER	
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP ATTN: IBM54 315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212			LEE, WILSON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/764,801

Applicant(s)

KRAFT ET AL

Examiner

Wilson Lee

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/2/04, 9/8/05, 9/26/05

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112**

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claims 1, 10, 19, lines 4, 5, “information” and “context information” are vague whether they are the same or not.

In Claims 2, 11, 20, line 4, “proximity class” is vague because it is not defined.

In Claims 6, 15, 24, “a weighted sum of occurrences” is not defined and understood.

In Claims 10-18, “A computer system” is not consistent with the steps or method defined in the bodies of the claims. The claimed limitations do not construct a computer system. Further, “logic” is not patentable. Is a method?

In Claims 19-27, “An article of manufacture” is not consistent with the steps or method defined in the bodies of the claims. The operations claimed do not define the invention of an article of manufacture. The steps do not “manufacture” anything.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2163

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-27, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Li (5,920,859).

Regarding Claims 1, 10, 19, Li discloses a method for processing anchor text, comprising:

- forming a set of anchors that point to a target document (See Col. 1, lines 20-52);
- grouping together anchors (head and tail) with same anchor text (certain text) (See Col. 1, lines 20-52);
- computing information for each group (See Col. 5, lines 15-39); and
- generating context information for the target document based on the computed information (See Col. 5-6).

Regarding Claims 2, 11, 20, Li discloses the method further comprising:

- determining a language of each document in a collection of documents (See Col. 10, lines 53-67),
- determining rank of each document in the collection of documents (See Col. 1, line 52 to Col. 2, line 67); and
- determining a proximity class (relevance score) of each document in the collection of documents (See Col. 10, lines 53-67).

Regarding Claims 3, 12, 21, Li discloses the method further comprising:

- determining a predominant language in the set of anchors (determining English or foreign language) (See Col. 10, lines 48-67); and
- pruning anchors from the set that are not in the predominant language (See Col. 3, lines 25-45, Col. 5, line 39 to Col. 6, line 15).

Regarding Claims 4, 13, 22, Li discloses pruning anchors from the set that include at least a portion of a path to the target document (See Col. 5, line 39 to Col. 6, line 15).

Regarding Claims 5, 14, 23, Li discloses the method further comprising: pruning anchors based on a configurable set of words (See Col. 5, line 39 to Col. 6, line 15).

Regarding Claims 6, 15, 24, Li discloses the method wherein computing information further comprises computing a weighted sum ( $\text{Weight}(t) = \text{TF} * \text{IDF}$ ) of occurrences for anchor text for anchors in each group (See Col. 2, lines 23-67).

Regarding Claims 7, 16, 25, Li disclose the method comprising computing information further comprises computing an accumulated rank (high summed relevance rank, summing the rank) for each group (See Abstract, Col. 4, lines 15-27, Col. 10, lines 59-68).

Regarding Claims 8, 17, 26, Li discloses that computing information further comprises computing a linguistic score for each group (English or Foreign language receive different score) (See Col. 10, lines 53-59).

Regarding Claims 9, 18, 27, Li discloses that computing information further comprises generating a relevance score for each group (See Col. 2, lines 8-23, Col. 2, lines 58-67, Col. 10, lines 6-19).

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, 27, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US2002/0169770) cited in IDS by applicant.

Regarding Claims 1, 10, 19, Kim discloses a method for processing anchor text, comprising:

- forming a set of anchors that point to a target document (See paras. 0066, 0067);
- grouping together anchors with same anchor text (See para. 0067);
- computing information (entry) for each group (See para. 0067); and
- generating context information for the target document based on the computed information (See para. 0066-0068)

Regarding Claims 2, 11, 20, Kim discloses the method further comprising:

- determining a language of each document in a collection of documents (See para. 0036),
- determining rank of each document in the collection of documents (See para. 0068-0072); and
- determining a proximity class (construct categories) of each document in the collection of documents (See Figure 2 and abstract).

Regarding Claims 3, 12, 21, Kim discloses the method further comprising:

- determining a predominant language in the set of anchors (See para. 0036-0037); and

Art Unit: 2163

- pruning anchors from the set that are not in the predominant language (See para. 0036-0037).

Regarding Claims 4, 13, 22, Kim discloses pruning anchors from the set that include at least a portion of a path to the target document (See para. 0036-0037).

Regarding Claims 5, 14, 23, Kim discloses the method further comprising: pruning anchors based on a configurable set of words (e.g. characters) (See para. 0036-0037).

Regarding Claims 6, 15, 24, Kim discloses the method wherein computing information further comprises computing a weighted sum of occurrences for anchor text for anchors in each group (See paras. 0055, 0056, 0070).

Regarding Claims 7, 16, 25, Kim disclose the method comprising computing information further comprises computing an accumulated rank for each group (See para. 0055, claim 20).

Regarding Claims 9, 18, 27, Kim discloses that computing information further comprises generating a relevance score for each group (See abstract, para. 0055).

### **Remarks**

Some references cited in IDS have been crossed because applicants fail to provide dates.

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kapur et al. (7,051,023) discloses a systems and methods for generating concept units from search queries. Kamada et al. (6,192,258) discloses a

Art Unit: 2163

mobile communication device with a rotary push switch. Fujisawa et al. (6,182,062) discloses a knowledge based information retrieval system. Byrd Jr. et al. (5,832,480) discloses canonical forms to develop a dictionary of names in a text.

### **Correspondence**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Wilson Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-1824.

Papers related to Technology Center 2800 applications may be submitted to Technology Center 2800 by facsimile transmission. Any transmission not to be considered an official response must be clearly marked "DRAFT". The official fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Wilson Lee  
Primary Examiner  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

6/26/06